

## Music

Rosie: Welcome and thank you for standing by. At this time, all participants are in a listen-only mode. I would now like to turn your meeting over to Ann Whalen. Ma'am, you may begin.

Ann Whalen: Thank you, Rosie. Welcome everybody, I'm Ann Whalen, Director of the Implementation and Support Unit at the U.S. Department of Education, and I'm joined by my colleague Ariel Jacobs. Thank you so much for participating in today's call on the FY 2013 Race to the Top - District Competition. The purpose of today's webinar is to address common questions that have been submitted to the Race to the Top email address and those raised during previous webinars.

We will not respond to questions that are specific to an approach or individual proposal. Rather, this webinar is intended to respond to questions for which we have received multiple inquiries. We will be using the Frequently Asked Questions, or FAQ document, to address these questions. The FAQ document is located on the FAQ page of the Race to the Top - District website. We encourage you to download this document and review the FAQs carefully. Again, this webinar will focus on questions about eligibility requirements, application requirements and intent to apply. We'll hold future webinars addressing additional topics as they come in through our email box at [2013.racetothetop.distict@ed.gov](mailto:2013.racetothetop.distict@ed.gov) and any additional questions submitted through the email and web chat today that we're unable to get to.

To ask questions today, we'll be using the chat feature. So when you're using this feature, please remember to submit your questions to the "All Panelists" function. We'll try to get to as many questions as possible. Again, we will not respond to questions individually; instead we will share the questions and responses with all participants. If you have questions that are not addressed during the webinar today or in the FAQ's, please feel free to submit them to the email address at [2013.racetothetop.distict@ed.gov](mailto:2013.racetothetop.distict@ed.gov), and we'll consider them for future webinars.

In the coming weeks, we'll be holding webinars regarding completing and submitting the application and preparing the budget. Again, we will also hold additional webinars on common questions that come in through our email box. Please refer to our website for registration and dates and times for these webinars.

We wanted to remind you where you can find some additional resources on the FY 13 Race to the Top - District Competition. Again, on our website we have the Executive Summary that provides key information and definitions from the Notice of Final Priorities (NFP) and Notice Inviting Applications (NIA). The application itself, the Frequently Asked Questions document, the Notice of Final Priorities, the FY 13 Notice Inviting Application, the Fast Facts document, the Background document that provides an explanation of how the program was developed and

explains the Department's theory of action and then finally, you can find the transcript and slides from our previous webinars as well as today's webinar.

Let's jump in. Before we get to a specific question, let's start with the overview of eligibility requirements. We had a number of questions that came into our email box about eligibility, so we just wanted to remind everybody that eligibility requirements must be met in order for an application to be considered for funding. Some of the questions that came in included:

"If a school district is participating in the Race to the Top state grant, can they apply for the Race to the Top - District Competition?"

"Are Charter Management Organizations (CMOs) considered LEAs?"

"Are private schools eligible?"

"Is a potential non-profit eligible to partner or apply?"

And "Are charter schools in my State eligible?"

We're going to try and answer as many of these as we can through our FAQ documents and, where additional clarification is needed, please don't hesitate to chat that in.

So before we get to specific questions, we just wanted to remind everybody about the definition of a local educational agency, or LEA, since it drives so much of what it means to be an eligible applicant. According to the Notice Inviting Applications, or NIA, for the purpose of the Race to the Top - District Competition, an LEA is an entity as defined in section 9101(26) of the Elementary Secondary Education Act, or ESEA, except that an entity described under section 9101 (26)(D) must be recognized under applicable state law as a local educational agency. Again, it must meet the definition of an LEA under ESEA section 9101(26) and be recognized under the applicable State law and definition of an LEA. Only entities that meet this definition are eligible to apply for Race to the Top - District funds.

We received many questions about whether districts receiving Race to the Top State funds are eligible to apply for the Race to the Top - District competition. Districts that are participating LEAs in the Race to the Top State grants are eligible to apply for the Race to the Top - District funds. However, successful FY 2012 Race to the Top grantees are not eligible to apply in the FY 13 competition. This includes school districts that are members of a successful Race to the Top - District consortium. You can find other general information regarding eligible organizations and entities in FAQ C-1. Again, if you're a participating LEA, so receiving funds from the State competition and you have not previously received a Race to the Top - District grant, you are eligible to apply for the FY 13 Race to the Top - District competition.

Questions about eligibility of Charter Management Organizations (CMO) and other educational organizations are answered in FAQ C-3 and C-11. We've received a number of questions about, "are Charter Management Organizations considered LEAs for the purposes of this grant?" The answer to this is that it kind of depends.

An Intermediate Service Unit and Educational Service Agency or Charter Management Organization would be eligible to apply only if it meets the definition of an LEA defined in the notice. Again, this definition is what we reviewed a couple of slides ago and is available in our NIA and Executive Summary. The LEA, or each of the member LEAs in a consortium, must sign and meet the eligibility requirements of the application and program requirements of Section 1-D. Again, those are in the Executive Summary and the NIA.

We've received questions about "whether a non-profit that does not meet the eligibility requirements may be a lead LEA for consortium applicants?" As stated in FAQ C-1, only LEAs (as defined in the notice), and consortia of LEAs are eligible to apply for the Race to the Top - District grant. Again, they must meet all other eligibility requirements in the NFP and NIA. However, some organizations, CMOs IHEs, etc., that are not eligible to apply as applicants can partner with eligible LEAs. FAQ C-19 explains that an applicant may choose to partner with organizations that do not meet the eligibility requirements of the FY 2013 Race to the Top - District competition. More information about non-LEA partners can be found in FAQ C-4.

Another question that came in was about private school eligibility. Private school participation and eligibility is addressed in FAQ G-4, in the "use of funds" section. Private schools are not eligible for the FY 2013 Race to the Top - District competition, nor may private schools receive grant funds through a sub-grant. Private schools may not be members of a consortium. Grant funds may not be used to provide financial assistance to students to attend private schools. An LEA applicant does have the flexibility to use FY 2013 Race to the Top - District grant funds to include private school students, teachers and other educational personnel and activities that the LEA deems appropriate and may contract with private schools for appropriate secular activities, consistent with the consortium's plan.

We've had a few questions coming in asking: "is my particular charter school eligible to apply?" or "is my particular CMO eligible to apply?" Again, we are not able to address specific inquiries about a particular proposal or a particular entity. We do hope FAQ's C-16 is useful. Information on the eligibility of individual charter schools, as opposed to a CMO, is again found in FAQ C-16. Public charter schools that meet the definition of an LEA (as defined in the notice) are eligible to apply. As you consider whether you represent an entity that is eligible to apply, please note that the Department is unable to advise potential applicants on whether they meet that eligibility requirement or the specific definition of the LEA as it pertains to that specific entity. We encourage you to carefully review the FAQs and familiarize yourself with the definition of an LEA and, if necessary, contact your State for

additional clarification on whether it recognizes your charter school, or CMO, as an LEA.

Here are some questions we received asking about the required number of participating students and how to calculate it. These questions address calculating the number of participating students, the point and time to determine a budget band based on the number of participating students and questions about how to determine the correct budget range. “What if we have less than 2,000 students district-wide and only 3 schools district wide? Can we apply for the grant?” First, let’s review the participating student requirement that is outlined in the second paragraph of FAQ C-1. To be eligible, an applicant must serve a minimum of 2,000 participating students. Certain consortia, meaning multiple LEAs that come together to form a consortium, may serve fewer than 2,000 participating students, provided that those students are served by consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students.

Like LEA, “participating student” and “participating school” are defined terms in the Notice. “Participating student” means a student enrolled in a participating school and who is directly served by an applicant’s plan under Absolute Priority 1. “Participating school,” which is a school that is identified by the applicant and chooses to work with an applicant to implement the plan under Absolute Priority 1, either one or more specific grade bands or subject areas or through the entire school and affecting a significant number of its students. So unless you have more than 2,000 students district-wide, you are not eligible to apply as an individual LEA, but if you partner with ten or more LEAs, you can serve fewer than 2,000 students.

Your application needs to meet specific thresholds at the beginning of the grant period. FAQ C-6 states that an applicant must propose in its application to serve at least 2,000 participating students at the time of the award, unless a consortium applicant of at least ten or more LEAs meets the exception described in the previous slide. If an applicant does not have a specific list of participating schools at the time of the application, the applicant must assure that it meets this eligibility requirement. The applicant will have 100 days from the date of the grant award to provide the list of participating schools and the number of participating students. The budget request must be within the award range for the number of participating students at the time of application, not cumulatively over the course of the grant. And again, an applicant must meet this requirement in order to be eligible for funding. We want to reiterate that for your application to be considered for funding, you need to meet the participating student eligibility requirement.

So the next question we received was: “do applicants need to meet a specific threshold at the beginning of the grant period, or can LEAs build up to the number of participating students over time?” So we’re still back to FAQ C-6, which presents an example of this. If an applicant proposes to serve 5,100 students in year one, with a plan to increase the number of participating students each year of the grant, the applicants budget request may provide for an increase each year to support the

additional students. However, it may not exceed \$20 million, which is the maximum amount in the award range for the number of participating students for the first year of the project if the applicant proposes to serve more than 10,000 students in year four of the grant. Again, your budget band is driven by the number of participating students who come in at the time of the application, the first year of proposed implementation of the grant.

Let's continue with the question of "do applicants need to meet a specific threshold at the beginning of the grant period or, can LEAs build up to the number of participating students over time?" FAQ C-7 further explains this requirement for calculating the number of participating students. Again, an applicant must provide an actual or approximate count of the number of participating students who would receive services in the first year of the project, not a cumulative count over the course of the grant.

And for clarification's sake, we are getting a number of questions that are coming in through the chat feature, and that's great. We will have time at the end of the webinar, so we made sure we are saving time to respond to those questions as they come into the chat function. We are going to try and make our way through the questions that have come into the email box first.

Here are a few examples of the questions we've received about the eligibility requirements regarding participating students from low-income families. These questions ask about how to calculate this percentage, the definition of students from low-income families, and what would happen if this percentage falls below the 40 percent threshold during the grant period. The requirement of meeting the percentage for participating students from low-income families is outlined in the third paragraph of FAQ C-1. At least 40 percent of participating students, across all participating schools must be students from low-income families, based on the eligibility of free or reduced-price lunches and subsidies.

Remember, both participating students and participating schools are defined terms in the NIA. The method for calculating the percentage low-income participating students is explained in FAQ C-9. An applicant determines the percent of low-income families by dividing the number of participating students who are from low-income families by the total number of participating students across all participating schools.

Consortium applicants would use the same method; take the number of participating students who are from low-income families and participating schools within all of the consortium and divide by the total number of participating students within all of the consortium LEAs. It is possible for an individual participating school to have less or more than 40 percent participating students who are from low-income families as long as, overall, across all participating schools and all participating LEAs, 40 percent of participating students are from low-income families.

We're now going to walk through the example that is located in FAQ C-9. So this is an example of the table that can be found in the application under Sub-Criterion (A)(2) on page 34. I'm going to demonstrate how to calculate the percentage of participating students from low-income families. In this example of a consortium applicant, there are two LEAs: school district A and school district B, and then three participating schools: elementary 1, middle school 1 and middle school 2. One would first calculate the percentage from each school. For example, elementary 1 in school district A has 700 participating students, of whom 500 are low-income. To calculate the percentage, divide 500 by 700. This results in 71.4% of participating students in district A, elementary school 1 being from low-income families. To calculate if a consortium is eligible, divide the total number of low-income participating students found in column D by the total number of participating students found in column B. In this example, it would be 52.27 percent of participating students across the entire consortium are from low-income families. Note that the percentage is calculated across the entire consortium, not by individual schools.

We've been asked what happens if the percentage of low-income participating students drops below 40 percent within the grant period, so within the four years of the grant term. FAQ C-22 explains that significant changes in the percentage of participating students from low-income families could affect a grantee's ability to meet the goals in its approved application or affect the scope of a grantee's project. The Department would review and consider such changes on a case-by-case basis. This could result in partial or complete termination of the grant.

We've received several general questions about the required assurances and some very specific questions regarding an LEA's capability to receive or match student-level data from preschool-through-12th grade in higher education. One person asked for clarification about, "what are the core educational assurance areas and how do I demonstrate my commitment to them?" The core educational assurance areas are a part of the four key areas identified in the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, including adopting standards and assessments aligned with college and career readiness, building data systems to improve instruction, recruiting, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and leaders, and turning around the lowest-achieving schools. In this competition, to meet the eligibility requirements, an applicant will demonstrate commitment to the core educational assurance areas by assuring through a signed application or signed MOU by the LEA superintendent or CEO that the LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-15 school year a teacher and leader evaluation system and a principal evaluation system and a superintendent evaluation system. Again, all three of those are defined terms within the notice.

The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college and career as demonstrated by:

- Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards or measuring all students' progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements;
- The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum, an individual teacher identifier with a teacher-and-student match and the capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth.
- The LEA has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade data and higher education data; and
- Any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' educational records complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, or FERPA.

Again, to meet this assurance requirement, the LEA applicant and every member of the consortium must sign an assurance that it can meet these requirements. That's the superintendent, CEO, local school board president and, where applicable, the local teacher union or association president are required to sign these assurances.

According to the NIA, an eligible applicant has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12th grade data and higher education data. This does not mean that the LEA must be matching preschool-through-higher education data at the time of the application; it does mean that an LEA must have the capacity to do so. Again, you must have the capacity to make these connections at the time you apply for a Race to the Top - District grant. The system may not be sophisticated, but the LEA should have a way of assessing and accessing this information. An LEA applicant must meet this assurance for the K-12 and higher education data even if the LEA does not include students in all of those grades. More details can be found here in FAQ C-32.

I'm now going to turn to my colleague Ariel Jacobs to answer some additional questions related to the Race to the Top - District competition.

Ariel Jacobs: Thank you, Ann. The FY2013 Race to the Top - District grant includes five Absolute Priorities. Absolute Priority 1 must be addressed throughout an applicant's proposal. While Absolute Priority 1 is not scored, applicants must meet this priority in order to receive funding. We have received multiple questions about the Absolute Priorities. Primarily, these questions ask how to address Absolute Priority 1 and how to select the appropriate Absolute Priority 2 through 5. While we haven't received many questions regarding Absolute Priority 1 (personalized learning), we do want to remind you that this Absolute Priority is required of all applicants. It should not be addressed as a separate section in the application; rather, it should be addressed throughout the application. After reviewing and evaluating the entire proposal, peer reviewers will assess whether or not the applicant has met Absolute Priority 1. You can find more details about Absolute Priority 1 in the first part of FAQ D-1.

Applicants must identify which one of the Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 applies to their application. Please note that applicants cannot select more than one of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5. In selecting grantees, the Department may consider high-ranking applications meeting Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 separately when making grants. Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 are not judged by peer reviewers; applicants will indicate in the application assurances in part IV, or part V and VI of the application which Absolute Priority applies. Again, applicants may choose only one of the Absolute Priorities 2 through 5. Applicants' responses to Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 will not affect an applicant's score or provide additional points; instead, this information will allow the Secretary to select a diverse group of grantees. Among those high quality applications that score well enough to fund, the Secretary may separately consider applicants located in rural and non-rural LEAs, as well as applicants located in Race to the Top and non-Race to the Top grantee States. If you're not sure whether your State is a Race to the Top State, please refer to FAQ D-1 for this list.

FAQ D-3 provides a chart that explains which of the Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 an applicant should select if it is a consortium made up of both rural and non-rural LEAs or Race to the Top and non-Race to the Top states. You should choose the Absolute Priority that applies to the majority, or more than 50 percent, of the LEAs in the consortium. Please refer to this chart to determine which Absolute Priority applies to you.

"In Absolute Priorities 3 and 5, what qualifies an LEA as rural?" FAQ D-4 explains the Department's definition of rural LEA for the purposes of this competition. A rural LEA is an LEA that, at the time of the application, is eligible under the Small Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under Title VI, Part B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). To find out if your LEA qualifies for these programs, check out the Small Rural School Achievement program at the web address provided in the FAQ on this slide.

We'll now answer questions about general application requirements and program information. Information that addresses these questions can be found in the application requirements section of the NIA. This slide shows examples of questions we received about the comment period and signatures required. It identifies topics such as who should provide comments and the signatures required. You can find these answers in FAQ F-2. The first paragraph of FAQ F-2 explains that, as part of its application, each LEA must provide its State at least ten business days to comment on the LEA's application. The State's comments or evidence that the applicant provided the State an opportunity to comment should be included with the application package. An LEA must also submit, as part of its application, its responses to the State's comments. LEAs in a consortium that are located in the same State can have the lead LEA or eligible legal entity submit the application to the State on behalf of the consortium.



We've had a few questions that state: "If an LEA does not have a mayor or town administrator within its boundaries, are there requirements for review by other bodies, for example, township trustees or county commissioners?" An LEA must also provide its mayor or town administrator at least ten business days to comment on the LEA's application. As with the State comments, the LEA should include as part of its application the mayor or town administrator comments or evidence that the LEA offered the mayor or the administrator ten days to provide comments. If the LEA is located in a town without a mayor, the LEA should provide the comment period to a city or town administrator or another comparable official. LEAs applying as part of a consortium that have the same mayor or comparable official may jointly solicit comments to shared mayors or comparable officials. The State and local comment periods may occur either sequentially or concurrently so long as each is provided ten business days to comment.

Next question: "if there have not been any changes in State or local officials since last year's application for the 2012 competition, do we need to obtain new signatures for this 2013 competition?" And the answer to that question is yes. An applicant that applied during the 2012 Race to the Top - District competition must offer State and local officials an opportunity to comment on the FY 2013 application, even if the respondents have not changed. In the application, applicants will assure that the State and local comment period was met (on page 17 for individual applicants and page 24 for consortium applicants) as well as cite the page reference as to where the submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in the appendix. At a minimum, these comments will be part of the evidence considered in Selection Criteria B-3 and B-4 and please note that the type of evidence is at the applicant's discretion. The Department is unable to provide advice on what evidence would be sufficient to meet this requirement.

"What agency or individual at the State level should provide comments on the application?" FAQ F-3 explains that the Department has not identified a specific agency or office within the State that must comment on Race to the Top - District applications. LEAs should clarify with their State or States to determine the appropriate agency or office within the State or States if you're a consortium, such as the governor's office, State education agency or attorney general's office that will comment on Race to the Top - District applications.

And here are some additional questions regarding LEAs with more than one mayor or comparable administrator. FAQs F-8 and F-9 address the questions on the previous slide. Each LEA in a consortium must give its state or mayor or comparable official an opportunity to comment on the application. And if an LEA has more than one mayor or comparable official, then the LEA must give each mayor or comparable official an opportunity to comment on its application.

We've also received numerous questions regarding the required teachers' union or association signature. The first of those questions is: "what does it mean to be

represented by a teachers' union or teachers' association?" For questions like these, please refer to FAQ C-33 and C-34. FAQ C-33 states that if an LEA employs teachers who are represented by a teachers' union or association in a bargaining or non-bargaining State, then the signature of the local teachers' union or association president is applicable. FAQ C-34 addresses questions about this eligibility requirement for LEAs located in States where collective bargaining is prohibited or where laws about collective bargaining are ambiguous or silent. If signatures are not applicable, then the absence of these signatures will not affect the application.

"What if you have multiple local teachers associations? How many of these association presidents are required to sign off on the application?" Please note that an LEA or lead LEA of a consortium that has more than one local teachers' union or association must submit the signature from either a representative or the exclusive agent or a signature from the chair of a union or association roundtable.

And we have received questions asking: "is a local teachers' union or association signature required for my district?" And the answer is that it depends on each LEA's individual context. So the answer is that it depends. The Department is unable to answer questions on specific applications or local contexts. If an applicant indicates that the signature of the local teachers' union or association is not applicable, then the applicant must provide a rationale in the table program-specific application assurances section of the application. The example on this slide is the table from page 19 of the application and is for individual applicants. Consortium applicants would provide this rationale in the table on page 26 of the application.

The final section of this webinar addresses questions we've received regarding the optional intent to apply. Some of these questions include: "is an intent to apply mandatory?" and, "will the list of districts that indicated an intent to apply be made public?" Filing an intent to apply is optional. There is no requirement for a potential applicant to submit an intent to apply after the deadline. However, we will be able to develop a more efficient process for reviewing grant applications if we know the approximate number of applicants that intend to apply for funding under this competition. Therefore, the Secretary strongly encourages each potential applicant to notify us of the applicant's intent to submit an application for funding by completing a web-based form by August 23, 2013. When completing this form, applicants will provide 1) the applicant's name and address, 2) whether the applicant is applying as an individual LEA or as a consortium of LEAs (if applying as a consortium, please provide a list of all LEAs in the consortium), 3) the expected budget request, and 4) a contact person, including a phone number and email address. A link to the form is on our website at [www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop.district](http://www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop.district).

Applicants that do not complete this form may still apply for funding. Further, no additional points or preference will be awarded to those applicants that complete the intent to apply form. Additionally, we encourage all LEAs that submit an intent to apply to also notify all relevant local stakeholders so that such stakeholders are aware of the applicant's intent to apply and can engage in the application process as

appropriate. More specific details regarding the grant submission process will be addressed in a future webinar.

The other question we received about intent to apply has been whether the list will be made public. And the answer to that is yes. After the August 23, 2013 deadline, the Department will publicly release a list of applicants intending to apply for FY 2013 Race to the Top - District awards. The list will only include the LEA names, including the names of each proposed member LEA in a consortium, the type of application, and the expected budget request. This list will not include any applicants that submitted an intent to apply after the deadline of August 23, 2013.

In addition to this webinar, which is posted on our website, the Department will offer additional technical assistance opportunities. More information on the upcoming technical assistance and webinars to answer questions submitted to the email box will be posted on the Race to the Top - District website listed on this slide. If you have questions about the program, please send them to the Race to the Top - District mail box at [2013.racetothetop@ed.gov](mailto:2013.racetothetop@ed.gov) and we may include them in one of the upcoming webinars. As a reminder, applications are due on October 3, 2013 by 4:30 PM Eastern time.

We will now take a look at some of the questions that have been submitted through the chat feature.

Ann Whalen: Great. Thanks, Ariel. A number of you have been sending in great questions. Thank you very much. Keep them coming if you have them. We had one question that asks: "what are the key differences in the programmatic focus or requirements or criteria from the 2012 to the 2013 Race to the Top - District competition, and where can I find a summary of the key differences from the 2012 to the 2013 competition?" In our initial webinar, which we held on August 7th, which is available on our website, we actually did have a slide that references the key changes from the FY 12 to the FY 13 competition that was slide 54. Again, while the vast majority of the priorities, criteria, and the rest of the competition are the same we have made a few changes. We are no longer providing the option of applying for an optional budget supplement. We believe this change enables the Department to maximize the number of grantees that would receive funding under a competition while still awarding grants of sufficient size to support bold improvements in learning and teaching. We've also reduced the minimum and maximum grant amounts for which an applicant may apply. And then finally we removed Selection Criterion (B)(5): Analysis of Needs and Gaps, based on our experience from the FY 12 competition as well as feedback that we've received prior to this year's competition. We believe that this criterion can be addressed in a much more integrated way in other parts of the application. If you are interested in more detail about what changed between last year and this year, you can look at page 48007 of the Notice Inviting Applications.

We had another question around stakeholder engagement and teacher input asking for additional clarity about what is the expectation for the comment period. First, I want to address the application requirements for the comment period, and then we can address the teacher and stakeholder engagement input of the comment period. The application requirement is that the State and local administrator and or mayor have ten business days to comment on an applicant's application. Again, this is an application requirement and evidence of this opportunity must be submitted with the application (either the comments or evidence that applicants provided these opportunities). It is optional for the applicant to then respond to these comments and include those as part of the application.

I also want to separate this a little bit from the Selection Criterion (B)(4) around stakeholder engagement and support. Under Selection Criterion (B)(4), an applicant may receive up to fifteen points by providing the extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder proposal, including A) a description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools are engaged in the development of the proposal, and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on the engagement and feedback, including 1) for LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement of support from the proposal from teachers in participating schools. Or 2) for LEAs with collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70% of teachers in participating schools support the proposal. Again, at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

And B) letters of support from key stakeholders such as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutes of higher education. So again, (B)(4) stakeholder engagement and support is a Selection Criterion, and an applicant can receive up to fifteen points. The State and local mayor or administrator comment period is a program requirement and must be included as part of the application.

We've received another question about maximum funding available: "is the maximum available funding request for the 2013 Race to the Top - District competition tied to the number of students who will be served during the first year of the grant or during the first hundred days after the grant is awarded?" If you look at FAQ C-7, we provide some additional information about this. The budget band in which an applicant would apply for is the number of participating students that the grant proposes to serve in the first year of the application. Again, you could either have your participating schools and students at the time of the application if you are able to identify all participating schools and students at the time of the application. Or, if you are unable to fully identify all participating schools and students at the time of the application, you may provide an approximate count, and then if you receive an award, within a hundred days after the date of the grant award you must

provide the Department a final list of participating schools and numbers of participating students. Again, you may either come in with the actual number of participating schools and students at the time of the application, or provide us the approximate count and, within a hundred days of receiving the grant award, you would have to provide us with that specific list. But the approximate count or actual count is what drives which budget band you would be applying for.

Our next question asks, “Will an LEA applicant be penalized if it writes directly to the Absolute Priority?” Again, we have asked applicants to address Absolute Priority 1 throughout the application, and if you look at the scoring rubric and instructions we provided in the application that’s what we’ve asked applicants to do and what we’ve asked peer reviewers to look at as they’re reviewing whether the applicant has met or not met Absolute Priority 1. An applicant would not be penalized if it wrote to it specifically, but again, that is not the guidance that the Department is giving applicants or peer reviewers as they look at whether the applicant has met or not met Absolute Priority 1.

Another question asks: “FAQ Race to the Top - District competition question C-19 indicates that LEAs can apply in partnership with non-profit or educational service agency; however, question F-15 indicates that because grantees must use appropriate procedures, applicants should not name a non-LEA contractor in its application. However, how then should the grantee apply in partnership? Is it possible that the district’s school-source procurement policies can name the partner if they determine that no contract can provide these same services?” Again, we encourage you to look at FAQ F-15. You should follow your local procurement rules. It varies locality by locality of whether you can sole source or not sole source, and name or not name potential partnerships. It also depends on whether you are in an existing partnership and are continuing services or whether you actually intend to partner with no grant funds and just intend to have other kinds of services. So it really depends on the local context and the local situation, so please use your best judgment. Look at the FAQs and, if necessary, consult your procurement official either within your LEA or State for additional clarity.

Another question has come in: “will consideration be given to unsuccessful 2012 Race to the Top - District applications for those districts that reapply in 2013?” In other words, will last year’s applications and scoring be taken into consideration, or will reviewers not have access to previous applications?” Peer reviewers will only be reviewing applications that are submitted for and meet the eligibility requirements of the 2013 Race to the Top - District competition. You must submit this year’s application, and it will be judged against the selection criteria, requirements and definitions, priorities of the FY 2013 Race to the Top - District competition. Again, if you would like to apply again you may, but you must submit a new application to be considered. We will not be providing peer reviewers access to last year’s application or the scoring or the notes from those.

Another question asks, "If our LEA has a CEO and no superintendent, do we need to address this in discussing evaluations systems?" We cannot actually provide a specific answer in this case because we don't know all of the facts. We ask that you use your best judgment. In some cases there may be an executive director that is the superintendent or CEO, but again, this is an eligibility requirement, and you must make an assurance that you are meeting this as part of being considered for a Race to the Top - District competition.

Another question asks, "Under FAQ C-19, does this mean that an IHE could be included in the application as a partner with the consortium to provide services and resources without going through the procurement process?" Similar to the question I answered two or three ago, it really depends on the State and local procurement rules and regulations. If the State allows for the interagency agreement, MOUs, or other types of agreements among public agencies without necessarily following the procurement processes, then it may be possible, but again you should really check with your local and State procurement administrator or your legal counsel to determine the best case in this given situation.

Another question has asked: "If I am in a right-to-work State that does not have teachers' unions, do I still need a signature from a teachers' association?" If we go to slide 44, you can see that FAQ C-33 and FAQ C-34 actually do address these questions, so we refer to you back to those.

Another question asks: "If an LEA is smaller than 2,000, can we still apply for a Race to the Top grant?" We're going to go to slide 15 to answer this question. An individual LEA that is proposing to serve fewer than 2,000 participating students is not eligible for a FY 2013 Race to the Top - District grant. A consortium of eligible LEAs that are made up of ten or more LEAs may serve fewer than two thousand participating students as long as at least 75% of the students served by each LEA are participating students. An individual LEA proposing to serve fewer than 2,000 students is not eligible to apply for Race to the Top - District grant. A consortium of ten or more LEAs may apply to serve fewer than two thousand participating students as part of a Race to the Top - District grant.

We have gone through all of the questions that have come in thus far as part of today's webinar. I think we are going to put everybody on mute for one-minute just to see if any last ones come in. If you have any more just please chat them in and we'll do our best to answer them.

Great so we've had one last question come in, and that is from our friend Scott who asks: "Will there be a Race to the Top 2014 competition?" Scott, that's a great question. We are actually still waiting on the FY 2014 budget from Congress. The President's budget did have a request for additional resources for Race to the Top competitions. We have yet to receive a budget yet, so we are doing our best to plan accordingly.

We've had a bunch more come in. We'll try our best to answer as many as possible in the last few minutes here. One asks: "are we following the procurement processes of all LEAs or just the lead LEA if we're applying as a consortium?" The answer is it depends on the different roles of the LEAs within the consortium. It's possible that the lead LEA is not the fiscal agent or procuring LEA for that consortium, so that's really up to that consortium to set up what the rules and responsibilities are for participating LEAs as part of a consortium. And again, if you will refer back to the webinar from earlier this week about consortium applicants, we do expect that in your MOUs or agreements that you define what those different roles and responsibilities are and lay them out so that each LEA that is part of that consortium signs and makes assurances to that effect as part of its MOU and/or agreement.

Another question asks about the eligibility requirement around evaluation systems, and whether there is additional information on what that means. We do have that information in the assurances around the eligibility requirements, and you can either look in our Executive Summary or you can look in the NIA, but we do ask that each LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later the 2014/2015 school year a teacher evaluation system, principal evaluation system, and superintendent evaluation system. All three of these systems and these terms are defined terms within the notice. If you look within the Executive Summary or in the NIA we do have the list of the defined terms and what it means to have an evaluation system that meets that expectation. So again, you can refer back to our Executive Summary or the NIA, where we have those full definitions laid out.

The question here also asked: "do these evaluation systems need to be explained in the proposal narrative?" At a minimum, each LEA that is applying must make an assurance that it has the evaluation systems, or it will have the evaluation systems in place that meet these expectations according to the definition. If you go through the Selection Criteria, there are some criteria that references use of evaluation systems to support and inform professional development and to support and inform educators within their practice. Again, that can be found in (C)(2). There may be a purpose or use if someone wants to provide additional information of how their evaluation system is able to do that, and that would be something that is scored and judged by the peer reviewers.

Our final question for today is: "whether the additional questions will be made part of the FAQ document?" As we see common questions come in that have not been answered through the FAQ document, we may add additional FAQs. Thus far, we have been able to answer questions that have come in using our current FAQ document. But today's webinar as well as the transcript will be available on our website. If there are particular things that came up today that may have been easier to understand through the traditional FAQ guidance document, we have made this resource available.

Again, finally as we thank you for your participation in today's webinar, we wanted to remind everybody that all our resources, including the FAQ document can be

found on our website if you have additional questions that come up as you are pulling together your proposal, working with your stakeholders, or putting the last touches on your plan, you should feel free to submit them to the email box at [2013.racetothetop.district@ed.gov](mailto:2013.racetothetop.district@ed.gov). We are hosting, at a minimum, two additional webinars in the near future: one on preparing your budget and one on filling out the application. Again, if we get a number of questions that come into our email box and we see common threads of inquires, we'll host additional webinars like today's where we will walk through them with the public, and we refer you back to our website to see the date and time of these future webinars. We really appreciate your great questions today and your time. Thank you very much and have a great day.